

Application No. 10/772965  
Reply to Office action of 6/24/2005  
Page 4

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claim 1 is hereby amended. Claim 5 is new.

The amendment of claim 1, reciting "wherein a thickness of the bridge section is sufficiently large to prevent an exterior surface of the bridge section from projecting radially", is supported by page 7, lines 26-28 and Figures 4 and 6. The amendment of claim 1, reciting "radially inwards", is supported by Figure 4. New claim 5 is supported by Figure 4.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiler (US DE 10131324) in view of Karasudani (US 4161,239). Claim 1 discloses a disk brake unit for a motorcycle, including a piston that projects beyond an outer peripheral edge of the brake disk in order to provide maximize braking leverage. The disk brake unit further includes a bridge section that connects inner and outer sections of a caliper body. The bridge section is sufficiently thick to prevent an exterior surface of the bridge section from projecting radially, thereby maintaining miniaturization of the disk brake unit.

The Examiner relies on Weiler to teach the bridge section required by claim 1 (see 23, Figure 1c). However, Weiler does not suggest that the thickness of the bridge section is sufficiently large to prevent an exterior surface of the bridge section from projecting radially, as required by claim 1. Rather, Weiler teaches a bridge section (23) having an exterior surface that radially protrudes (see Figure 1c). In contrast, the disk brake unit according to claim 1 ensures rigidity of the caliper body without making the outer profile of the caliper body large (see Figure 6 and page 7, lines 29-33).

Further new claim 5 requires that the thickness of the bridge section is at least as thick as a thickness combination of the inner pad, the outer pad, and the brake disk. Weiler does not suggest a bridge section (23) meeting this requirement (see Figure 1c). In contrast, the disk brake unit according to claim 5 provides a large bridge between the

Application No. 10/772965  
Reply to Office action of 6/24/2005  
Page 5

inner and outer sections that is able to reliably maintain rigidity (see page 2, lines 19-23 and page 7, lines 23-30).


While Karasudani may teach inner and outer pads that do not project out further than the outer peripheral edge of the brake disk, the reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Weiler, as previously noted.

Therefore, the combination of Weiler and Karasudani does not teach or suggest all the limitations of the rejected claim, and one knowledgeable in the art would not look to the combination of the cited references to teach the invention of claim 1. Favorable reconsideration and reexamination of claim 1 are requested.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiler, in view of Karasudani, and further in view of Reeves (US 6,478,121). Claim 3 should be considered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends. Reeves does not remedy the deficiencies of Weiler and Karasudani, as previously noted. Applicant is not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claim. Favorable reconsideration and reexamination of claim 3 is requested.

In view of the above, early issuance of a notice of allowance is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. 29,165, at (612)455-3802.

Respectfully Submitted,



Curtis B. Hamre  
Reg. No.: 29,165  
Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.  
225 South Sixth Street  
Suite 2650  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612.455.3800

Dated: August 9, 2005

CBH/mfe:lad